

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Clarence Paul Davis,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Reynaldo Meyers, Director; Milton Pope,
County Commissioner; Assistant Dir.
Harrell; Captain Higgins,

Defendants.

C.A. No.: 4:08-01881-RBH

O R D E R

This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

No objections were filed to the Report and Recommendation. The Report and Recommendation [docket entry #39] was mailed to the plaintiff on February 9, 2009 [docket entry #40]. The mail was returned to the court as undeliverable on February 20, 2009, marked “ NO

LONGER AT THIS ADDRESS RETURN TO SENDER.” Plaintiff has not provided the court with an updated address as required by the Order of May 21, 2008, and, as a result, the court has no means of contacting him concerning his case. Plaintiff was warned and advised in that order to keep the Clerk apprised of his current address, and that a failure to do so may result in the dismissal of the case. Accordingly, this action is due to be dismissed pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.Proc. 41(b). Furthermore, in the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

After a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge Rogers’ Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein. It is therefore

ORDERED that the defendants’ motion to dismiss for lack of prosecution [docket entry #38] is **GRANTED** and plaintiff’s complaint is **DISMISSED** with prejudice for failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. BRYAN HARWELL
United States District Judge

Florence, South Carolina
March 2, 2009